



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,262	02/24/2004	Yoichi Morimoto	FUJO 20.967	8916
26304	7590	09/06/2007	EXAMINER	
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP 575 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585			LEE, JUSTIN YE	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/06/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/785,262	MORIMOTO, YOICHI
Examiner	Art Unit	
Justin Y. Lee	2617	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 24 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). *request for reconsideration*

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-3, 5 and 9-12.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet
 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
 13. Other: _____.


 DUC M. NGUYEN
 SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding the McBride reference, applicant states that, McBride reference teach away from the claimed feature of immediately connecting a call.

In contrast to applicant's assertions, McBride reference disclose the phone is answered with a prerecorded message if the caller ID is not found in the CID list (Fig. 3 steps 115-119 and Fig. 10 steps 215-218). Walsh et al. also disclose this limitation in (col. 2, lines 65-col. 3, lines 9 and col. 3, lines 62-col. 4, lines 7, call is connected to a message recorder that prompts the calling party for identification and record the identification if the caller ID of the calling party is not registered within a caller ID database).

Regarding the McBride reference, applicant states that, McBride reference do not disclose include any disclosure or suggestion that such a "canned greeting" would be meaning less or nonsensical.

In contrast to applicant's assertions, nonsensical message is not clearly disclosed in the specification of the current application. Also, any word or phrases can be a sensual or nonsensical message when interpreted by different people.

Regarding the Walsh reference, applicant states that, Walsh does not suggest the need to immediately connect such a one-time call. In contrast to applicant's assertions, Walsh reference disclose immediately connect a call if the caller ID is not registered within a caller ID data base (col. 2, lines 65-col. 3, lines 9 and col. 3, lines 62-col. 4, lines 7). McBride reference also disclose such feature in Fig. 3 steps 115-119 and Fig. 10 steps 215-217 and 246 and paragraph 85 and 92.

Regarding the McBride reference, applicant states that, Callele teaches away from immediately imposing a call charge since such portion describes it as a disadvantage of conventional answering machines that is to be overcome.

In contrast to applicant's assertions, Callele reference discloses immediately imposing a call charge when a call is connected to hear a pre-recorded message (col. 1, lines 13-15). Therefore, this particular limitation is well known in the art before the priority date of this current application.

Regarding the combination of references, applicant states that, Examiner has failed to establish *prima facie* obviousness by only relying upon improper hindsight.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). All references used in combination teach processing an incoming call therefore all the references are combinable..